



UWS Academic Portal

Chronic fatigue syndrome (CFS)/Myalgic Encephalomyelitis (ME) and Fibromyalgia (FM)

McKay, Pamela G.; Martin, Colin R.; Walker, Helen; Fleming, Mick

Published in:
British Journal of Pain

DOI:
[10.1177/2049463719875164](https://doi.org/10.1177/2049463719875164)

E-pub ahead of print: 05/10/2019

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication on the UWS Academic Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

McKay, P. G., Martin, C. R., Walker, H., & Fleming, M. (2019). Chronic fatigue syndrome (CFS)/Myalgic Encephalomyelitis (ME) and Fibromyalgia (FM): the foundation of a relationship. *British Journal of Pain*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2049463719875164>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the UWS Academic Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact pure@uws.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Chronic Fatigue Syndrome (CFS)/ Myalgic Encephalomyelitis (ME) and Fibromyalgia (FM): The foundation of a relationship.

Introduction

Chronic Fatigue Syndrome (CFS)/ Myalgic Encephalomyelitis (ME) and Fibromyalgia (FM) are disabling syndromes, without an established aetiology, a diagnostic test, or curative treatment.¹⁻³ Currently these complex syndromes are governed by their own individual diagnostic criteria and management direction, but display overwhelming evidence of similar symptoms. The prevalence of CFS/ME is estimated that in General Practice 10 patients in 10,000 (0.4%) are likely to have CFS/ME.^{4,5} The prevalence of FM has been recorded as 2-3% of the population.⁵

Early research addressing the similarities of CFS/ME and FM dates back to the 1990's, most of which were performed prior to the development and publishing of the accepted American Centre for Disease Control (CDC) Criteria ⁶ for diagnosis CFS/ME (Table 1), and when the American College of Rheumatology (ACR)⁷ diagnostic criterion for FM was in its infancy. These may be obsolescent, but are relevant in the context of the current research. Much of the literature available may discuss CFS/ME and FM together, however little research actually investigates if the symptom experience is the same.^{1,4, 8-}

¹⁴ The National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE)⁸ published guidelines in 2007 for the management of CFS/ME, which are currently under review. CFS/ME comprises a broad range of complex symptoms which include headaches, muscle aches and pains and/or joint pain.⁸ FM is characterised by chronic widespread musculoskeletal pain which persists for ≥ 3 months, with pain in 11 of the 18 identified pain points (Fig 1 and 2 illustrated by the dots on the body diagrams).^{2,7} Symptoms include: flu like and

gastrointestinal symptoms; pain; fatigue; sleep disturbance; anxiety and/or depression; impact on self esteem and reduced Quality of Life.^{8,14} Evidence suggests that pain is one of the prominent symptoms associated with both syndromes, although historically this has been one of the dividing factors during diagnosis, when the similarities between these syndromes outweigh the differences.^{7,8, 11, 15,16} Confirming a diagnosis of CFS/ME or FM is a long and complex processes due to the subtle differences in the initial presenting symptoms.^{8,11,14} Evaluating the evidence presented in context with medical advances and increasing investment in research, suggested a need to revisit this area of study. Considering these issues and to provide the most appropriate evidence based care, it is important to investigate these syndromes, as similar management strategies may be beneficial for both groups.

US Case Definition of Chronic Fatigue Syndrome (Fukuda et al, 1994)
--

- | |
|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. medically unexplained chronic fatigue, of new onset ≥ 6 months, which is 2. not substantially alleviated by rest, not the result of ongoing exertion, 3. substantial reduction in occupational, educational, social and personal activities. 4. Anxiety and depression are not always excluded |
|--|

<p>The following conditions, if present, exclude diagnosis of CFS: past or current major depression with melancholic or psychotic features, delusional disorders, bipolar disorders, schizophrenia, anorexia nervosa, bulimia, or alcoholic or substance abuse within 2 years before the onset of CFS or any time afterward.</p>
--

- | |
|--|
| <p>2. ≥ 4 or more symptoms, occur for ≥ 6 months. These are
Self reported persistent or recurrent impairment in short-term memory or concentration severe enough to cause substantial reductions in previous levels of occupational, educational, social, or personal activities</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Sore throat b) Tender cervical lymph or axillary lymph nodes c) Muscle pain d) Multiple joint pain without joint redness or swelling e) Headaches of a new type, pattern or severity f) Unrefreshing sleep. g) Post exertional malaise lasting more than 24 hours. |
|--|

Table 1: US Case Definition of Chronic Fatigue Syndrome⁶

The purpose **of this, the** first phase was primarily to confirm the symptoms and their severity in CFS/ME and FM and to identify any occurring themes. **At present in the absence of evidence confirming CFS/ME and FM share the same underlying pathology, it may be reasonable to suggest they have strong overlapping symptoms, which should be afforded all the same management options. The evidence presented will create the foundation of the second phase, to establish if a relationship exists between the symptoms of CFS/ME and FM.**

Methods

Participants

People self selected to participate and were recruited through advertisements on the internet and through CFS/ME and FM self help groups. Participants were aged ≥ 16 with a confirmed diagnosis of CFS/ME or FM from a **General Practitioner (GP)** or specialist were included. Participants with CFS/ME were required to satisfy the requirements of the American (CDC) Criteria for CFS/ME⁶ and participants with FM were required to satisfy the ACR Criteria.⁷ Suitability for inclusion was based on screening answers to questions. Exclusions were as a result of any additional chronic conditions or anxiety and depression, self diagnosis, or incomplete data sets.

Consent

A web-based template (www.cfsfibromy.co.uk) was designed to capture **data using a number of** questionnaires. **Informed consent was confirmed electronically, and may** have been retracted up to the point of data analysis. Ethical approval for this study was granted by the appropriate University.

Data Collection

Nine questionnaires had formerly been subject to validity and reliability checks and reflect the main symptoms and issues which impact people with CFS/ME and FM (**Table 1**). These sections comprised the disease specific questionnaire for CFS/ME, the American CDC Symptom Inventory and diagnostic criterion for CFS/ME,^{6, 17} and for FM the ACR diagnostic criterion for FM⁷ and the Fibromyalgia Impact Questionnaire (FIQ).^{18, 19, 20}

The remaining questionnaires measured symptoms identified, as follows: The McGill Pain Questionnaire (MPQ);²¹ The Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index (PSQI);²² The Multidimensional Fatigue Inventory (MFI);²³ The Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS);²⁴ The Health Related Quality of Life (HRQoL) (SF-36 V2) Questionnaire;²⁵ The Multidimensional Health Locus of Control Scale (MHLOC Form C)²⁶ and The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSES).²⁷ Each questionnaire had its own discrete set of instructions, with a consent section at the beginning, detailed in Table 2.

In addition, questions were posed to collect demographic and comprehensive information on the sample. Details of the research were presented to facilitate the participants submitting their consent. Data were manually screened to confirm all questionnaires were fully completed and submitted, prior to analysis.

Symptom	Questionnaire	Purpose	Scoring	Reliability	Validity	Author
	Specific Questionnaire/ Criteria					
Diagnostic Criteria for CFS/ME	American Centre for Disease Control (CDC) Diagnostic Criteria for CFS/ME.	Diagnostic criteria. Table 1. addition measures, frequency,	See In No Cut off scores ≥ 6 months of symptoms More than 4	Good Cronbachs alpha (α) ranging from 0.82-0.91 $r > 0.77^{17, 44}$	Good Significance correlations $r = 0.64-0.94$ ($p < 0.05$)	Fukuda et al., 1994. Wagner et al., 2005

	Symptom Inventory	intensity and duration of 8 symptoms	45	0.001) ¹⁷ 44		
Diagnostic Criteria for FM	American College of Rheumatology Diagnostic Criteria for FM	Diagnostic criteria for FM. Fig 1 and 2 illustrate pain points Comprises 20 items to assess the impact of symptoms of FM on patients' daily lives and their response to any management/treatment offered. Questions address patient's function, pain level, fatigue, sleep disturbance and psychological distress.	No cut off score ≥ 11 out of 18 tender points Scores ≥ 50 confirmed FM ≥ 70 Severe FM	n/a Good $\alpha = 0.72 - 0.93$ $r = 0.58$ to $0.83^{18\ 19}$	n/a Good Significant correlations With the Arthritis Impact Scale ($p < 0.0001$) ⁴⁶	Wolfe et al., 1990.
Symptom experience of FM	The Fibromyalgia Impact Questionnaire (FIQ)					Burkhardt et al., 1991.
	Generic Questionnaire					
Pain	McGill Pain Questionnaire (MPQ)	Measures frequency and intensity of pain, namely: <i>Affective, Evaluative, Sensory</i> and <i>miscellaneous</i> . There is a body diagram to indicate areas of pain, 72 descriptor words to assess pain, and pain rating intensity scale. Each section is scored based on the guidelines.	No cut off score. Higher scores are indicative of an increased level of pain.	Good $\alpha > 0.9$ $r \geq 0.89$ ($P < 0.001$) ²¹ 47	Good Co-efficient s ranging between 0.3 and 0.4 ²¹	Melzack, 1975.
Fatigue	Multidimensional Fatigue Inventory (MFI)	Measures 20 items on 5 dimensions: <i>general, physical, mental, reduced motivation</i> and <i>reduced activity</i> . Each dimension contains four items, two items relating to fatigue and two items which are contra indicative of fatigue.	Scores range from 4 -20. Domains should not be summed together. High scores indicative of high levels of fatigue. A score of ≥ 10 on the <i>reduced activity</i> subscale, and severe fatigue is highlighted by a score	Good $\alpha > 0.80$ with average of 0.84 Stability $r \geq 0.72^{23\ 48}$	Good $P < 0.001$ High scores 0.77 general fatigue, 0.7 physical fatigue, 0.61 reduced activity, 0.56 reduced motivation on mental fatigue 0.23	Smets et al., 1995.

			of ≥ 13 on the <i>general fatigue</i> scale.		$(p < 0.01)^2$ 3 48	
Sleep Quality	The Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index (PSQI)	Measures sleep over the period of 1 month. Comprising 19 items generating seven component scores measuring; <i>subjective sleep quality, sleep latency, sleep duration, habitual sleep efficiency, sleep disturbance</i> , the use of <i>sleeping medication</i> , and <i>day-time dysfunction</i>	Each scale scores 0 (no difficulty) to 3 (severe difficulty), which yields a score from 0 to 21. High scores indicate poor sleep quality and a global score of ≥ 5 indicates sleep disturbance	Good $\alpha > 0.83$ Mean component scores $r = 0.58$ Individual items $\alpha > 0.83$ $r \geq 0.85$ $(p < 0.0001)^{22}$ 49 50	Good $r = 0.33$ $(p < 0.001)^{22}$ 49	Buyse et al., 1988.
Quality of Life	The SF-36 V2 Questionnaire (SF-36 V2)	Comprises 36 questions within 8 domains of health namely: <i>pain general health, Vitality, Physical functioning, Social functioning, Role limitations through physical problems, Role limitations due to emotional problems and mental health</i> including anxiety, depression, loss of behavioral/emotional control and physiological well being. Results in 2 summary components of health physical and mental well being of the patient. Aims to identify the positive and negative aspects of health which are most important to patients.	Score on Scale from 0 to 100, which represent the highest level of functioning. Poor HRQoL scores ≤ 35 , \geq than 60 best HRQoL.	Good $\alpha > 0.7$ in all aspects except emotional role $\alpha > 0.6^{28}$ 51 52	Good Construct validity measuring $> 0.7^{51}$	Ware & Sherbourne, 1992.
Anxiety and Depression	Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS)	Measure <i>anxiety</i> and <i>depression</i> in non-psychiatric populations Comprises 14	Each question scores 0 to 3. Total scores 0 to	Good $\alpha = 0.93 - 0.98$, $t = 0.93-0.97^{24}$ 53 54	Good Range $0.6-0.8^{24}$ 53	Zigmond and Snaith, 1983.

Table 2: Description of Questionnaires used for data collection.

Results

Descriptive statistics were used to report demographic details. Individual scoring methods for each of the questionnaires confirmed participant's symptom experience, if they satisfied the requirements of the American CDC Criteria for CFS/ME⁶ and the ACR criteria for FM.⁷

Descriptive Analysis

The final sample comprised CFS/ME $n = 101$ and FM $n = 107$ participants. All were ≥ 16 , with the age ranging between 17-75 years, and all were eligible for inclusion. Incomplete data sets were omitted. The Mean (M) age of the CFS/ME ($n = 101$) group was $M = 45.52$ years and the Standard Deviation (SD) was 12.52, and for FM ($n = 107$), $M = 47.20$, $SD = 10.77$. The CFS/ME sample comprised 85.2 % ($n = 86$) females and 14.8 % ($n = 15$) males. The FM group comprised 88.9 % ($n = 95$) females and 11.2 % ($n = 12$) males.

CFS/ME 45.5%, ($n = 46$) participants were more readily diagnosed by a General Practitioner. In the case of FM a greater portion were diagnosed by a Rheumatologist 57.9% ($n = 62$).

All participants with CFS/ME confirmed that they had experienced their symptoms for the required ≥ 6 months, and ≥ 3 months for a FM diagnosis.^{7, 15} The CFS/ME group experienced their symptoms for a $M = 10.69$ years $SD = 8.91$, ranging from 1 year to 37 years. Participants with FM experienced symptoms for ranging from 1 year to 28 years, $M = 12.62$ years $SD = 9.85$.

All participants experienced more than the minimum requirement of ≥ 5 symptoms listed by the American CDC criteria, 7.9% CFS/ME ($n = 8$) and FM 1.8% ($n = 2$) groups. With both groups experiencing ≥ 4 symptoms required confirming the requirements of the

CFS/ME criteria.^{6 17} The maximum number of 8 additional symptoms was experienced by the CFS/ME 49.0% (n = 51) and FM 59.8% (n = 61) groups.

The CFS/ME group (n = 101) had a Median score of 8 and Mode of 6 pain points, below the minimum requirement of 11. The FM (n = 107) group presented with a Median of 14 and Mode of 18 pain points, based on the ACR diagnostic criteria for FM,⁷ exceeding the minimum required number of 11 pain points. The most frequent number of pain points reported by the CFS/ME group were 6 (n = 14), followed by 10 and then 8 pain points (n = 12). In the FM group the most frequently reported number of pain points were 18 (n = 31 participants) followed by 16 and 14 (n = 14 participants). The total number of participants with ≥ 11 pain points for CFS/ME was 29.7% (n = 30) and FM was 76.6% (n = 82). Figures 1 and 2 illustrate the areas of the body based on the MPQ which incorporate the ACR criteria for FM pain points, where participants indicated they experienced their pain.

(Insert Figure 1)

The total numbers of pain points were calculated by assessing the areas where participants indicated their pain was located. The main areas identified by both groups were the cervical areas 52.5% (n = 53), CFS/ME and for FM 64.5% (n = 69) and the upper shoulders 52.5% (n = 53), for CFS/ME and 72% (n = 77), for FM (Fig.1). In addition, 66.4% (n = 71) of FM participants experienced pain in their lower backs. This was also the second most problematic area of pain recorded for the CFS/ME group 31.7% (n = 32) to 45.5% (n = 46) all these areas included the ACR pain points (Fig.1). A higher portion of the FM group reported pain in these areas when compared to the CFS/ME group.

(Insert Figure 2)

The main areas of pain identified for the anterior view of the body (Fig. 2) were the neck for 36.6% (n = 37) for the CFS/ME group, and 54.2% (n = 58) of the FM group, but in this instance no pain points were included. The chest area, which includes the pain points, were found to be problematic for both groups with 43.0% (n = 46) of the FM participants and 23.3% of the CFS/ME participants selecting this area. In addition participants were able to indicate areas of the body they experienced pain which did not incorporate the ACR pain points, concluding that pain was experienced in multiple areas of the body including the face and head which are not indicative of the ACR pain points for diagnosis.

Table 3 presents the results for the participants Mean scores for the individual questionnaires for both groups.

Variable	Mean score CFS/ME	Mean score FM	Cut off Scores
American CDC symptoms Inventory			
Sore throat	3.79	3.59	
Tender Lymph Nodes and or Swollen Glands	4.60	4.25	
Fatigue After Exertion	12.43	12.99	
Muscle Aches and Pains	9.51	13.79	
Joint Pain	7.78	11.48	
Unrefreshing Sleep	10.97	13.19	
Headaches	6.27	6.96	
Memory and or Concentration Problems	9.37	9.62	
Total Degree of Distress	64.72	75.87	N/A
FIQ			
Total Physical Impairment	57.55	64.89	
No of days felt well	8.28	8.49	
No of days missed work	5.48	5.80	
Impact of symptoms on work	7.04	7.50	
How bad pain has been* Mdn	7.0	8.0	
How tired have you been* Mdn	9.0	9.0	
Feeling in the morning	6.65	7.97	
Morning stiffness* Mdn	7.0	8.0	
How tense/ nervous	4.50	5.64	
How depressed or blue	4.21	5.48	
Overall Score FIQ	62.97	70.60	≥ 50 confirmed FM ≥70 Severe FM
MPQ			
Number of pain points	8.49	13.59	
Total Sensory Score	15.10	19.36	
Total Affective Score	7.53	10.57	
Total Evaluative Score	2.89	3.76	
Total Score Miscellaneous	5.71	7.97	
Sum of All dimensions of MPQ	31.23	41.65	Scores between 24% to 50% of total score confirm severe pain
MFI			
Total Score General Fatigue	16.60	16.83	
Total Score Physical Fatigue	16.49	16.46	
Total Score Reduced Activity	15.09	14.91	
Total Score Reduced Motivation	12.90	13.20	
Total Score Mental Fatigue	15.13	15.20	
PSQI			
Sleep Duration	1.08	1.10	
Sleep Disturbance	1.82	1.85	
Sleep Latency	1.96	1.99	
Day Dysfunction due to Sleepiness	2.05	2.11	
Sleep Efficiency	1.61	1.74	
Overall Sleep Quality	2.02	1.93	
Medication to Sleep	1.39	1.45	
Total Score PSQI	11.94	12.18	≥ 5 poor sleep quality
SF-36 V2			
Physical Functioning	38.81	27.10	
Social Functioning	31.44	31.78	
Role Physical Functioning	23.39	22.61	
Role Mental Functioning	64.27	51.79	
Mental Health	59.65	51.82	
Vitality	14.48	13.84	
Pain	38.29	22.42	
General Health	26.07	25.85	
Change in Health	41.58	30.14	Scores of 0 best health scores close to 100 poor health
HADS			
Total Anxiety	8.52	10.60	
Total Depression	8.30	10.10	
Total Score HADS	16.82	20.70	≤ 7 no anxiety or depression, 8 to 9 borderline case, ≥11 anxiety and depression
MHLOC			
Internal Sum	17.66	19.03	
Chance	17.76	16.97	
Doctors	7.46	8.10	
Other People	8.29	8.0	High scores in particular area confirm beliefs in that area
RSES			
Total RSES	14.35	15.02	< 15 poor self esteem

Table 3: Description of the Valid and reliable questionnaires to measure the symptoms

in the CFS/ME and FM group

FIQ

Results for the FIQ confirm that 61.3% (n = 61) of the CFS/ME group scored ≥ 50 , indicative of FM symptoms present, and 13.8% (n = 14) of participants scoring ≥ 70 , indicative of severe symptoms of FM.²⁸ In the FM group 80.3% (n = 86) of participants scored ≥ 50 and 28.0% (n = 30) of participants scored ≥ 70 . The FIQ total scores for the CFS/ME group ranged between 8.86, and 90.4, and for the FM group were between 12.00 and 96.76.

MPQ

Results for the MPQ which poses a range of questions relating to different aspects of pain, including; *Sensory, Affective, Evaluative and Miscellaneous*, confirmed that a significant amount of pain was experienced by both groups. Although there are no cut off scores for the MPQ, people with painful conditions will normally have scores ranging from 24% to 50% of the total score with an average of 30%.^{29, 30}

MFI

Fatigue was confirmed by both groups on the 5 individual domains of the MFI (*General fatigue, Physical Fatigue, Reduced Activity, Reduced Motivation and Mental fatigue*).²³ Scores ranged between 4 and 20, with total scores not recommended. The minimum score identified for the CFS/ME group was 4 for *physical fatigue* and *reduced motivation*, and the maximum score was 20, for the remaining items of the MFI, the minimum scores were identified as ≥ 5 with the maximum score of 20. In the CFS/ME sample, 99.0% of (n = 100) participants experienced fatigue on each domain of the MFI. In the FM group the minimum score for *general fatigue* and *physical fatigue* was 4 with the minimum score on the remaining domains ≥ 5 , and the maximum score on all the domains were 20. In the FM sample 98.1% of (n = 105) participants experienced fatigue on all the domains of the MFI. These results confirmed that both the CFS/ME and FM groups

experienced a high level of fatigue, a symptom which is indicative of a diagnosis of CFS/ME and associated with FM.

PSQI

The PSQI²⁹ confirmed poor sleep quality in 43.6% (n = 44) of CFS/ME and 47.7% (n = 51) of FM participants. The number of participants who had taken *Medication* ≥ 3 times per month to assist with sleep were 39.6% (n = 40) of the CFS/ME group, and 41.1% (n = 44) of the FM group. The minimum total score recorded for *poor sleep quality* on the PSQI for the CFS/ME group was 5, and the maximum was 20. The minimum total score on the PSQI for the FM group was 3 and the maximum score was 21. These findings confirm that both the CFS/ME and FM groups experienced poor sleep quality.

SF-36 V2

The SF-36 V2²⁵ confirmed reduced HRQoL in both groups. Scores closer to 0 suggest impaired, and scores closer to 100 suggest the best HRQoL.³¹ The results presented in Table 3 confirm participants with CFS/ME and FM have a reduced HRQoL with the Mean scores on most of the components below 50. The exceptions were for the *mental health* and role *mental functioning* components, where scores were ≥ 50 which suggests participants HRQoL was not affected by their mental health. *Role physical function* was found to have the greatest impact on both the CFS/ME and FM groups. *Role mental function* did not have as big an impact on participants HRQoL.

HADS

The results for the total score for *anxiety* on the HADS²⁴ ranged from 0 to 20 and confirmed that out of the total sample of CFS/ME (n = 101) 49.5% (n = 50), and FM (n = 107) 27.1% (n = 29) participants, did not display symptoms of *anxiety*.³² There was

a borderline case of *anxiety* for 14.9% (n = 15) of CFS/ME and 20.5% (n = 22) of FM participants, with the remaining 35.6% (n = 36) of CFS/ME and 52.3% (n = 56) of FM participants confirmed as displaying symptoms of *anxiety*.

The total score for *depression* identified that 37.6% (n = 38) of CFS/ME and 28.0% (n = 30) of FM participants did not display symptoms of *depression*. There was a borderline case for *depression* for 32.6% (n = 33) of CFS/ME and 30.8% (n = 33) of FM participants. The remaining 29.7% (n = 30) of CFS/ME and 41.1% (n = 44) of FM participants in this sample expressed symptoms of *depression*.

The total score on the HADS confirmed that 9.9% (n = 10) of CFS/ME and 2.8% (n = 3) of FM participants did not display symptoms of *anxiety* and *depression*. There was a possible caseness for 15.8% (n = 16) of the CFS/ME and 4.8% (n = 5) of FM participants for *anxiety* and *depression*. The remaining 74.0 (n = 75) of CFS/ME and 92.5% (n = 99) of FM participants confirmed they were affected by symptoms of *anxiety* and *depression*. These results confirmed that both groups experience some degree of *anxiety* and *depression*, with the FM group displaying higher scores on the HADS than the CFS/ME group.

MHLOC

A total score is not recommended for the MHLOC,²⁶ the scores for the *internal* and *chance* scales range between 6 and 36.³³ The scores for the *doctors* and *powerful other* scales range between 3 and 18. Higher scores on a particular scale suggest stronger beliefs in that area, either internal or external locus of control. The Mean score for the *internal* and *chance* scores for CFS/ ME are just on the Median (n = 18), for these subscales and below the Median score (n = 9) for the *external* scores (*doctors* and *other people*). Results for the FM group identify slightly higher scores than the Median score for the *internal* sum and below the Median scores for *chance*, *doctors* and *other people*. The minimum score for both groups on the *internal* and *chance* scales were 6 where the maximum score was 33, for the CFS/ME group and 35 for the FM group on the *internal* scale. The maximum result on the *chance* scale for the CFS/ME group were 33 and for the FM group 32. The minimum score calculated for the *doctors* and *other people* scales were 3 for both groups. The maximum score recorded for the CFS/ME group on the *doctors* domain was 17, and for the FM group was recorded as 18. The maximum score recorded for *other people* for both groups was 18. The results presented suggest on average the CFS/ME and FM groups present with similar scores.

RSES

The RSES³⁴ scores range from 0 to 30. Results did not confirm that either the CFS/ME or FM groups presented with scores ≥ 25 . In the CFS/ME group 36.6% (n = 37) and in the FM group 53.3% (n = 57) of participants confirmed scores ≤ 15 . These results suggest that the FM group experienced a lower degree of self esteem than the CFS/ME group.

Discussion

Unlike historical research into CFS/ME and FM this research measured the symptoms of CFS/ME and FM using self assessment questionnaires to confirm and reaffirm the

nature of symptoms associated with CFS/ME and FM. The characteristics, such as age and gender of the CFS/ME and FM groups are supported by historical findings of CFS/ME and FM.^{5 35} Both groups confirmed their diagnosis by satisfying the requirements of the CFS/ME criteria⁶ and the FM criteria.⁷

The **specialty of Clinicians who diagnosed the participants in this** sample of CFS/ME and FM is also characteristic of **earlier** findings. Diagnosis of CFS/ME by a GP are not unexpected where in contrast people with FM are more readily assessed and receive their diagnosis from a Rheumatologist or a General Practitioner.³⁶ In contrast people with CFS/ME are not readily assessed or referred onto specialist services, as supported by the current findings.³ This suggests that people with FM more readily have access to specialist services than patients with CFS/ME.

The results from the CFS/ME group confirmed that not all participants satisfied the minimum of 11 pain points to comply with the requirements of the FM criteria. However, the MPQ presents clear evidence that the CFS/ME group experienced pain in different areas of the body, confirming pain is as debilitating a symptom as in FM. This is revealing as the reviewed FM criteria² has removed the highly prescriptive pain points, and focuses on areas of pain, to assess the patient holistically. Furthermore there is evidence which highlights that the complex nature of this pain assessment has led to it being performed incorrectly or omitted by Clinicians as a diagnostic tool for FM.³⁷ Taking all these factors into consideration it may be reasonable to conclude in this instance that this sample of participants satisfied the requirements of the FM criteria.⁸ In contrast the FM group confirmed they met the requirements of the CFS/ME criteria.

Pain is widely documented as a defining feature for a diagnosis of FM^{2,7} and fatigue has been the primary symptom associated with a diagnosis of CFS/ME.^{18,38} Taking this into consideration with the results presented from the MPQ, PSQI and MFI confirmed that

both groups experienced pain and fatigue which impacted on their HRQoL. The high levels of pain identified reflect the findings from studies comparing CFS/ME and FM with other painful conditions such as chronic pain and arthritis, which identified their pain was equivocal.^{39,40} The findings presented from the **MFI confirms that** the debilitating fatigue that plagues people in CFS/ME is also an issue for people with FM. This suggests that the symptom of fatigue in FM is as much a management priority as pain, as it is a distressing symptom identified as negatively impacting on a patient's quality of life.²³ In view of these findings and current research, this suggests that the individual diagnostic criteria for CFS/ME and FM are sensitive towards the diagnosis they are designed for. Therefore consideration should be given to reviewing current published guidelines for CFS/ME in view of the arguments provided for not creating guidelines for FM.¹⁷

In addition to pain and fatigue our findings confirmed that both groups experienced poor sleep quality, and reduced HRQoL with the list of symptoms being extensive. Furthermore participants in both groups experienced these symptoms to a debilitating degree, which caused impairment and had an impact on their daily lives. These groups did not confirm high levels of anxiety, depression or low self esteem, which are in contrast to historical reports, suggesting this is not the main pressing issues in CFS/ME and FM.^{34, 35, 3, 41} With the current lack of successful management plans and taking these findings into consideration, improvement to HRQoL should be given priority in patients with CFS/ME and FM. This is pertinent as it has been identified that CFS/ME and FM negatively impact on occupational, social, personal and economical aspects, which are frustrating and devastating for a person who previously enjoyed good health.^{42, 43} **These results raise questions regarding compartmentalizing the symptoms into either a diagnosis of CFS/ME or FM. Fatigue, the main symptom used to make a diagnosis of CFS/ME and Pain, the primary diagnostic symptom of FM, have both been**

confirmed as problematic for both groups. These findings suggest that there is a grey area between the two diagnoses. The data presented suggests that the similarities between the symptoms measured outweigh any differences. The evidence presented provides compelling debate to recommend that further research in this area is undertaken. This would further investigate the significance of the current findings, to identify if there maybe ramifications for the classification of CFS/ME and FM and its future management.

Strengths and Limitations of this study

To our knowledge this is the first study to assess the symptom experience of CFS/ME and FM using the methods described. This study brings attention to an area with CFS/ME and FM which has not been researched in a number of years.

Conclusion

This preliminary data provided evidence of a high level of symptoms which impact on daily life. Furthermore the results suggest that both groups experience a high level of pain which is not always localised to the prescriptive pain areas outlined by the ACR criteria for FM. In addition both groups experience debilitating fatigue. The strong evidence presented in **this first part of the study**, alludes to the fact that both CFS/ME and FM may have a similar symptoms experience, **and this should be afforded more investigation.**

What is already known on this topic

Both groups share similar symptoms but it has not been confirmed whether they are the same syndrome. Historically pain is the main diagnostic factor in FM and fatigue is the main diagnostic factor in CFS/ME. Separate diagnostic criteria exist for CFS/ME and FM but their trajectory of management options may be different based on diagnosis. Research into this area is obsolescent.

What this research adds

To date this approach to assessing the symptom experience of CFS/ME and FM has not been used. This study confirms that fatigue associated with CFS/ME and pain associated with FM maybe problematic for each group regardless of diagnosis. Pain and Fatigue were historically key defining symptoms. This study highlights that in the absence of specific aetiology confirming the cause of CFS/ME and FM there is a need to address HRQoL where management options are limited or unsuccessful. This research provides a basis for future research to establish if the syndrome experience of CFS/ME and FM are the same.

References

1. Romano GF, Tomassi S, Russell A, et al. Fibromyalgia and Chronic Fatigue Syndrome: The Underlying biology and related theoretical Issues. *Adv Psychosom Med* 2015;34: 61-77
2. Wolfe F, Clauw DJ, Fitzcharles MA, et al. The American College of Rheumatology preliminary diagnostic criteria for Fibromyalgia and measurement of symptom severity. *Arthritis Care Res* 2010; 62: 600-610.
3. Action for ME (2012) Ignorance, Injustice and Neglect: an investigation into NHS Specialist Services provision for people with ME/CFS. www.tinyurl.com/ignoranceinjustice
4. Johnston S, Brenu EW, Staines DR, et al. The adoption of Chronic Fatigue Syndrome/Myalgic Encephalomyelitis case definitions to assess prevalence: A systematic review. *Ann Epidemiol* 2013; 23: 311-376.
5. Martinez-Lavin M, Infante O, Lerma C. Hypothesis: The chaos and complexity theory may help our understanding of Fibromyalgia and similar maladies. *Semin Arthritis Rheum* 2008; 37: 260-264.
6. Fukuda K, Straus SE, Hickie I, et al. The Chronic Fatigue Syndrome: A comprehensive approach to its definition and study. *Ann Intern Med* 1994; 121: 953-959.
7. Wolfe F, Smythe HA, Yunus MB, et al. The American College of Rheumatology 1990 Criteria for the Classification of Fibromyalgia. *Arthritis Rheumatol* 1990; 33: 160-172.

8. National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence 53 *Chronic Fatigue Syndrome/ Myalgic Encephalomyelitis (or Encephalopathy): Diagnosis and Management of CFS/ ME in Adults and Children* August 2007 NICE: London
9. Goldenburg DL, Simms RW, Geigen A, et al. High frequency of Fibromyalgia in patients with Chronic Fatigue seen in primary care practice. *Arthritis Rheumatol* 1990; 33: 381-387.
10. Norregaard J, Bulow PM, Prescott E, et al. A four-year follow-up study in Fibromyalgia Relationship to Chronic Fatigue Syndrome. *Scand J Rheumatol* 1993; 22: 35-38.
11. Sullivan PF, Smith W, Buchwald D. Latent class analysis of symptoms associated with Chronic Fatigue Syndrome and Fibromyalgia. *Psychol Med* 2002; 32: 881-888.
12. Mehendale A, Goldman MP. Fibromyalgia Syndrome, idiopathic widespread persistent pain or Syndrome of Myalgic Encephalomyelopathy (SME): What is its nature? *Pain Pract* 2002; 2: 35-46.
13. Geisser, ME, Gracely RH, Giesecke, T, et al. The association between experimental and clinical pain measures among persons with Fibromyalgia and Chronic Fatigue Syndrome. *Eur J Pain* 2007; 11: 202-207.
14. Kop WJ, Lyden A, Berlin AA, et al. Ambulatory monitoring of physical activity and symptoms in Fibromyalgia and Chronic Fatigue Syndrome. *Arthritis Rheum* 2005; 52: 269-303.
15. Weir PT, Harlan GA, Nkoy FL, et al. The Incidence of Fibromyalgia and its associated Co morbidities: A population based retrospective cohort study based on International Classification of Diseases, 9th Revision Codes. *J Clin Rheumatol* 2006; 12: 124-128.

16. Wessely S, Chalder T, Hirsch S, et al. The prevalence and morbidity of Chronic Fatigue and Chronic Fatigue Syndrome: A prospective primary care study. *Am J Public Health* 1997; 87: 1449-1455.
17. Wagner D, Nisenbaum R, Heim C, et al. Psychometric properties of the CDC Symptom Inventory for assessment of Chronic Fatigue Syndrome. *Popul Health Metr* 2005; 3:
Available: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16042777> (Accessed: 12th October 2008)
18. Bennett R. The Fibromyalgia Impact Questionnaire (FIQ): a review of its development current version operating characteristics and uses clinical and experimental. *Rheumatol* 2005; 23: 154-162.
19. Burckhardt CS, Clark SR, Bennett RM. The Fibromyalgia Impact Questionnaire: Development and Validation. *J Rheumatol* 1991;18:728-733 (Modified 1997)
20. Bennett RM, Bushmakin AG, Capperli JC, et al. Minimal important difference in the Fibromyalgia Impact Questionnaire. *J Rheumatol* 2009;36:1304-1311.
21. Melzack R. The McGill Pain Questionnaire: Major properties and scoring methods. *Pain* 1975;1:277-299.
22. Buysse DJ, Reynolds CF, Monk TH, et al. The Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index: A new instrument for psychiatric practice and research. *Psychiatry Res* 1989; 28: 193-213.
23. Smets EM, Garssen B, Bonke B, et al. The Multidimensional Fatigue Inventory (MFI) Psychometric qualities of an instrument to assess fatigue. *J Psychosom Res* 1995; 39: 315-325.

24. Zigmond AS, Snaith RP. The Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale. *Acta Psychiatr Scand* 1983; 67:361-370.
25. Ware JE Jr, Sherbourne CD. The MOS 36-item Short-Form Health Survey (SF-36): I Conceptual framework and item selection. *Med Care* 1992; 30: 473-483.
26. Wallston KA, Wallston BS, Devellis R. Development of the Multidimensional Health Locus of Control (MHLC) scales. *Health Educ Monogr* 1978; 6:160-170.
27. Rosenberg M. *Society and the adolescent self-image* Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press 1965.
28. Burckhardt CS, Clark SR, Bennett, RM. Fibromyalgia and Quality of Life, a comparative analysis. *J Rheumatol* 1993; 20: 475-479.
29. Wilkie DJ, Huang HY, Reilly N, et al. Nociceptive and neuropathic pain in patients with lung cancer: A comparison of pain quality descriptors. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 2001; 22: 899-910.
30. Marshall R, Paul L, McFadyen AK, et al. Pain characteristics of people with Chronic Fatigue Syndrome. *J Musculoskelet Pain* 2010; 18: 127-137.
31. Stewart AL, Hays RD, Ware JE. The MOS short Form General Health Survey: Reliability and Validity in a Patient Population. *Med care* 1988; 26: 724-732.
32. Snaith RP. The Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale. *Health Related Quality of life Outcomes* 2003;1: Available: www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12914662 Accessed: 25th May 2014)
33. Wallston KA, Stein MJ, Smith CA. Form C of the MHLC scales a condition-specific measure of locus of control. *J Pers Assess* 1994; 63: 534-553.
34. Friedberg F, Jason LA. Chronic Fatigue Syndrome and Fibromyalgia: Clinical assessment and treatment. *J Clin Psychol* 2001; 57: 433-455.

35. Vincent A, Lahrm BD, Wolfe F, et al. Prevalence of Fibromyalgia: a population-based study in Olmstead County, Minnesota, utilising the Rochester Epidemiology Project. *Arthritis Care Res* 2013; 65: 286-792.
36. Craggs-Hinton, C. *Living with Fibromyalgia: New edition (Overcoming Common Problems)*. Sheldon Press: London 2010
37. Hauser W, Wolfe F. Diagnosis and diagnostic tests for Fibromyalgia (syndrome). *Rheumatismo* 2012; 64: 194-205.
38. Mease PJ, Palmer RH, Wang Y. Effects of Malcipran on the multidimensional aspects of fatigue to pain and function Pooled analysis of 3 Fibromyalgia trials. *J Clin Rheumatol* 2014; 20:195-202.
39. Wilkie DJ, Savedra MC, Holzemier WL, et al. Use of the McGill Pain Questionnaire to measure pain: A meta-analysis. *Nurs Res* 1990; 39: 36-41.
40. Pirins JB, Van der Meer JW, Bleijenberg G. Chronic Fatigue Syndrome. *Lancet* 2006;367:346-355
41. Wolfe F, Clauw DJ, Fitzcharles MA, et al. The American College of Rheumatology preliminary diagnostic criteria for Fibromyalgia and measurement of symptom severity. *Arthritis Care Res* 1990; 62: 600-610.
42. Lowry TJ, Pakenham KI. Health Related Quality of Life in Chronic Fatigue Syndrome: Predictors of physical functioning and Psychological distress. *Psychol, Health Med* 2008; 13: 222-238.
43. Nunez M, Fernandez-Sola J, Nunez E, Fernandez et al. Health related quality of life in patients with Chronic Fatigue Syndrome: group cognitive behavioral therapy and graded exercise versus usual treatment. A randomised controlled trial with 1 year follow up. *Clin Rheumatol* 2011; 30: 381-389.

44. Vermeulen RCW. Translation and validation of the Dutch language version of the CDC Symptom Inventory for assessment of Chronic Fatigue Syndrome (CFS). *Popul Health Metrics* 2006; 4: 12.
<https://doi.org/10.1186/1478-7954-4-12>
45. Hawk C, Jason LA, Torres-Harding S. Reliability of a Chronic Fatigue Syndrome Questionnaire. *J. Chronic Fatigue Syndr.* 2006; 13: 41-66.
46. Meenan RF, Gertman PM, Mason J. Measuring health status in Arthritis. The Arthritis Impact Measurement Scales. *Arthritis Rheumatol* 1980; 23: 146-152.
47. Ngamkham S, Vincent C, Finnegan L, et al. The McGill pain questionnaire as a multidimensional measure in people with cancer: an integrative review. *Pain Manag Nurs* 2012; 13: 27-51.
48. Lin JS, Brimmer D, Maloney EM, Reeves WC. Further validation of the Multidimensional Fatigue Inventory in a US adult population. *Popul. Health Metr* 2009; 7 www.pophealthmetrics.com/content/7/1/18
49. Smith M, Wegner T. Measures of Sleep. The Insomnia Severity Index, Medical Outcomes Study (MOS) Sleep Scale, Pittsburgh Sleep Diary (PSD) and Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index (PSQI). *Arthritis and Rheum* 2003; 49: 184-196.
50. Veiga DM, Cunali R, Bonotto D, Cunali PA. Sleep Quality in patients with temporomandibular disorder: a systematic review. *Sleep Sci* 2013; 6: 120-124.
51. Ware JE Jr, Kosinski M, Gandek B, et al. The Factor Structure of the SF-36 Health Survey in 10 countries: Results from the IQOLA Project. *J Clin Epidemiol* 1998; 51: 1159–1165.

52. Perrot S, Vicaut E, Servant D, Ravaud P. Prevalence of fibromyalgia in France: a multi-step study research combining national screening and clinical confirmation: The DEFI Study (Determination of Epidemiology of Fibromyalgia). *BMC Musculoskelet Disord* 2011; 12: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21981821>
53. Bjelland I, Dahl AA, Hauch TT, Neckelmann D. The Validity of the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale. An updated Literature Review. *J Psychosom Res* 2002; 52: 69-77.
54. McCue P, Martin CR, Buchanan T, et al. An investigation into the psychometric properties of the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale in individuals with Chronic Fatigue Syndrome. *Psychol, Health Med* 2003; 8: 425-439.
55. Martin CR, Thompson DR, Chan DS. An examination of the psychometric properties of the Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale (RSES) in Chinese acute Coronary Syndrome (ACS). *Psychol Health Med* 2006; 11: 597-521.
56. White C, Schweitzer R. The role of personality in the development and perpetuation of Chronic Fatigue Syndrome. *J Psychosom Res* 2010; 48: 515-524.
57. Sinclair SJ, Blais MA, Gansler DA, et al. Psychometric properties of the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale: Overall and across demographic groups living within the United States. *Eval Health Prof* 2010; 33: 56-80.
58. Michielsen HJ, Van Houdenhove B, Leirs I, et al. Depression, attribution style and self-esteem in Chronic Fatigue Syndrome and Fibromyalgia patients: is there a link? *Clin Rheumatol* 2006; 25:183-188.

